



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,828	05/04/2001	Zachary A. James	RSW9-2001-0077-US1	7479

7590 06/29/2005

Gregory S. Bernabeo, Esq.
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/848,828

Applicant(s)

JAMES ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,11-15,17,21 and 23-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,7-10,16,18-20, and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: request for continued examination, filed 6 April 2005, to the original application filed 4 May 2001.
2. The previous rejection of claims 1, 3, 15, 21, and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been removed.
3. Claims 1-4 and 6-31 are pending. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 15, 25, and 31 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Publication 2002/0111924 A1) in view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition.

As per claim 4, Lewis discloses a method for efficient processing of a document encoded in a markup language including receiving a document intended for delivery to a target (See Lewis, page 5, paragraph 0062, lines 7-8), processing the document using a special purpose processor dedicated to processing documents encoded in the markup language (See Lewis Figure 3, element 56, and Page 8, paragraphs 0108 and 0110),

Art Unit: 2176

and passing the processed document to the target for further processing by a general purpose processor (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0112). Lewis shows in Figure 3, the separation between a dedicated XML processor and a general XML processor (See Lewis, Figure 3, elements 56 and 30). Lewis does not disclose expressly including in the general purpose processor a microprocessor that is separate from the special purpose processor. A microprocessor is defined as a central processing unit on a single chip that, when included with memory and power, defines a computer (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition, Page 307, definition of Microprocessor). Since Lewis shows the dedicated XML processor to be physically separate from the general XML processor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the a microprocessor, as defined above, would be included with the general processor, separate from the special purpose processor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to apply the definition of microprocessor to the general purpose processor including a microprocessor to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4, providing the benefit of speed and efficiency that microprocessors bring to Lewis.

As per claim 6, Lewis discloses the limitations of claim 4 above, with reference to the definition disclosed in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition. Lewis also discloses performing a transformation on the document (See Lewis, Page 10, paragraph 0145).

As per claim 11, Lewis discloses the limitations of claim 4 above, with reference to the definition disclosed in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition. Lewis also discloses communicating the document, as processed, to an application process

through a bus of a printed circuit board (See Lewis, Page 2, paragraph 0023, and Figure 4).

As per claim 12, Lewis discloses the limitations of claim 4 above, with reference to the definition disclosed in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition. Lewis also discloses communicating the document, as processed, to a target via a communications network (See Lewis, Abstract).

As per claim 13, Lewis discloses the limitations of claim 4 above, with reference to the definition disclosed in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition. Lewis also discloses that the target is a local application process (See Lewis, Abstract).

As per claim 14, Lewis discloses the limitations of claim 4 above, with reference to the definition disclosed in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition. Lewis also discloses that the target is a remote device (See Lewis, Abstract).

Claims 1, 3, 15, 17, 25, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Publication 2002/0111924 A1) in view of Hall (U.S Patent 5,939,868).

As per claim 1, Lewis discloses a method for efficient processing of a document encoded in a markup language including communicating a data model representing the document through a bus of a printed circuit board (See Lewis, Figure 4, and Page 2, paragraph 0023) from a special purpose processor configured for processing the encoded document (See Lewis, Figure 3, element 56, and Page 8, paragraph 0110) to a general purpose processor that is configured for further processing of the encoded

document as processed by the special purpose processor (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0112). Lewis does not disclose expressly that the special purpose processor and the general purpose processor are provided as a respective integrated circuit on the printed circuit board. Hall discloses providing a single circuit board housing different chips, or integrated circuits (See Hall, Column 1, lines 35-41). Lewis and Hall are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the single circuit board design of Hall to support the multiple processors of Lewis. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow different processors with different voltage requirements to be mounted on the same circuit board (See Hall, Column 1, lines 36-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hall with Lewis for the benefit of allowing different processors with different voltage requirements to be mounted on the same circuit board to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per claim 3, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Lewis also discloses that the data model represents a document encoded in XML (See Lewis, Page 4, paragraph 0059).

As per claims 15 and 31, Lewis discloses a method for efficient processing of a document encoded in a markup language including a memory (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0226), a general purpose processor operatively connected to the memory for executing computer readable code stored in the memory, the computer readable code configuring the general purpose processor to perform processing distinct from certain

processing of documents encoded in the markup language, such as providing centralized collection of monitoring data, compiling inventory and transaction history records, and receiving and distributing reconfiguration data (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0112), and a special purpose processor operatively connected to the memory, the special purpose processor being specially configured for certain processing of documents encoded in the markup language (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraphs 0108 and 0110), and where the special purpose processor is a dedicated processor (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0110). Lewis does not disclose expressly that the special purpose processor and the general purpose processor are provided as a respective integrated circuit on the printed circuit board. Hall discloses providing a single circuit board housing different chips, or integrated circuits (See Hall, Column 1, lines 35-41). Lewis and Hall are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the single circuit board design of Hall to support the multiple processors of Lewis. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow different processors with different voltage requirements to be mounted on the same circuit board (See Hall, Column 1, lines 36-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hall with Lewis for the benefit of allowing different processors with different voltage requirements to be mounted on the same circuit board to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15 and 31.

As per claim 17, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Lewis also discloses that the data model represents a document encoded in XML (See Lewis, Page 4, paragraph 0059).

As per claim 21, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Lewis also discloses that the special purpose processor includes a supplemental general purpose processor for executing computer readable code for processing the document (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0108).

As per claim 23, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Lewis also discloses a telecommunications device operatively connected to the general purpose processor and capable of communicating via a communications network (See Lewis, Page 6, paragraph 0082), and a first program stored in memory and executable by the general purpose processor for controlling the special purpose processor to process the document, and for communicating the document, as processed, to a target (See Lewis, Figure 3, element 52).

As per claim 24, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 23 as described above. Lewis also discloses a second program stored in memory and executable by the general purpose processor for recognizing the document as encoded in the markup language and responsively controlling the special purpose processor to process the document (See Lewis, Figure 3, element 28).

As per claim 25, Lewis discloses a printed circuit board including a general purpose processor for executing computer readable code stored in a memory (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0112), and a special purpose processor operably connected

Art Unit: 2176

to the general purpose processor being configured for processing documents encoded in a markup language (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraphs 0108 and 0110). Lewis does not disclose expressly that the special purpose processor is a dedicated integrated circuit. Hall discloses providing a single circuit board supporting different chips, or integrated circuits (See Hall, Column 1, lines 35-41). Lewis and Hall are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the single circuit board design of Hall to support the multiple processors of Lewis. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow different processors with different voltage requirements to be mounted on the same circuit board (See Hall, Column 1, lines 36-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hall with Lewis for the benefit of allowing different processors with different voltage requirements to be mounted on the same circuit board to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

As per claim 26, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Lewis also discloses that the special purpose processor includes a dedicated integrated circuit that is specially configured for processing the document (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0110).

As per claim 27, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Lewis also discloses that the processing includes transforming the document (See Lewis, Page 10, paragraph 0145).

As per claim 28, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Lewis also discloses that the special purpose processor includes a supplemental general purpose processor (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0108).

As per claim 29, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Lewis also discloses a memory operably connected to the supplemental general purpose processor (See Lewis, Page 8, paragraph 0116) and computer readable code stored in the memory and executable by the supplemental general purpose processor for processing the document (See Lewis, Figure 3, element 28).

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Publication 2002/0111924 A1) in view of Hall (U.S. Patent 5,939,868) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition.

As per claim 30, Lewis and Hall disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Lewis and Hall do not disclose expressly including in the general purpose processor a microprocessor that is separate from the special purpose processor. A microprocessor is defined as a central processing unit on a single chip that, when included with memory and power, defines a computer (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Third Edition, Page 307, definition of Microprocessor). Since Lewis shows the dedicated XML processor to be physically separate from the general XML processor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the a microprocessor, as defined above, would be included with the general processor, separate from the special purpose processor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

apply the definition of microprocessor to the general purpose processor including a microprocessor to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30, providing the benefit of speed and efficiency that microprocessors bring to Lewis.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 15, 21, and 23-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 7-10, 16, 18-20, 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100